

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-27, 29-39 and 42-63 are currently pending. Claims 1, 5, 7-17, 22, 26, 27, 29-31, 42-45, 56 and 60 have been amended. Claims 6, 20, 28, 40, 41 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinable for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claims 37-39 the Official Action states that there is “no antecedent basis for ‘said processor elements’”. Claim 37 has been amended such that the antecedent basis for “said processor elements” is now correct.

Accordingly, based upon the above described claim amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 22, 23, 26, 27, 32, 42-45 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al (USP 7,342,887) in view of Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298).

Claims 3, 17-19, 24, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al. (USP 7,342,887), Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298), and De Silva et al. (USP 7,499,456).

Claims 4, 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al. (USP 7,342,887), Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298), and Yazaki et al. (US

Publ. No. 2005/0163049).

Claims 6-7, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al. (USP 7,342,887), Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298), and Kiremdjian et al. (US Publ. No. 2003/0081623).

Claims 9-10, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al. (USP 7,342,887), Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298), and Donis et al. (US Publ. No. 2002/0075882).

Claims 12-16, 33-36 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al. (USP 7,342,887), Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298) and Wilkinson et al. (USP 6,094,715).

Claims 48-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sindhu et al. (USP 7,342,887), Brunheroto et al. (USP 6,643,298), Wilkinson et al. (USP 6,094,715), and De Silva et al. (USP 7,499,456).

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Cehic for his time and courtesy during an interview held with the undersigned on August 10, 2010. During the interview, the rejection of the claims was discussed. The undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that, unlike the applied documents in the rejection, exemplary embodiments of the present invention can use only a single queue in which to store the packet records in the exit order. The Examiner agreed during the interview that this feature seemed to differentiate from the documents applied in the various grounds of rejection.

Accordingly, all of the independent claims have been amended to reflect that the

queue which stores the packet records is a “sole queue for handling all packet records which enter the system”, or similar language.

Accordingly this Request for Continued Examination and Amendment are being filed in lieu of pursuing an Appeal in this time in an earnest effort to expedite the prosecution of this application.

It is believed that the foregoing discussion and amendments address all of the outstanding rejections from the Final Office Action dated January 8, 2010. If, however, the Examiner has any further questions or concerns regarding this application he is urged to contact the undersigned at (540) 361-1863 in order to quickly resolve same.

Respectfully submitted,

POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC

By: /stevenmdubois/

Steven M. duBois

Registration No. 35,023

Date: September 8, 2010

Customer No. 42015
Potomac Patent Group PLLC
P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
(540) 361-1863